<u>Remarks</u>

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 10-12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,343 of *Emens et al.* ("*Emens*").

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 13, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Emens*.

New claims 17-20 have been added.

The examiner has object to the title. In response, applicant has provided a replacement title.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Emens* because *Emens* does not disclose a method for configuring a network device with a set of network configuration parameters that enable the network device to communicate via a local network as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, *Emens* discloses a method for forwarding user commands to remote devices. (*Emens*, col. 2, lines 43-49 and col. 5, lines 27-33). *Emens* shows a variety of devices that communicate via a network 100 but does not disclose how those devices are configured with network communication parameters.

Given that claims 2-6 depend from amended claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-6 are not anticipated by *Emens*.

It is also submitted that amended claim 7 is not anticipated by *Emens*. Amended claim 7 is a system that includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 1 including generating a set of network configuration parameters that enable a network device to communicate via a local network. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 1 and *Emens* also apply to amended claim 7.

- 7 -

Given that claims 8-16 depend from amended claim 7, it is submitted that claims 8-16 are not anticipated by *Emens*.

It is further submitted that new claim 17 is not anticipated by *Emens*. New claim 17 is a system that includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 7 including obtaining a set of network configuration parameters under control of a configuration server such that the network configuration parameters enable a network device to communicate via a local network. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 7 and *Emens* also apply to new claim 17.

Given that new claims 18-20 depend from amended claim 7, it is submitted that new claims 18-20 are not anticipated by *Emens*.

Applicant further submits that claims 2-6, 8-9, 13, 15, and 16 are not obvious in view of *Emens*. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 13, 15, and 16 depend from amended claims 1 and 7 and applicant has shown that *Emens* does not disclose configuring a network device with a set of network configuration parameters under control of a configuration server such that the network configuration parameters enable the network device to communicate via a local network as claimed in amended claims 1 and 7.

The examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to enable a user enter an address for a network device. (Page 6, lines 11-21, Office Action, 9-8-04). Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1 and 7 include the limitation of generating network configuration parameters <u>under control of a configuration server</u> and the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a configuration server as claimed in amended claims 1 and 7. Instead, *Emens* discloses server computers 104 that forward user commands to remote devices. (*Emens*, col. 2, lines 43-49 and col. 5, lines 27-33).